CANUCK LAW
Reporting That You're Not Getting Elsewhere (Do Your Own Research To Verify)

SEPTEMBER 20, 2019 BY RONNIE

Shut Up & Pay Your UN Taxes, Uppity Peasants (Satire)

(Ways to raise money)





PARIS AGREEMENT

The Parties to this Agreement,

Being Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, hereinafter referred to as "the Convention",

Pursuant to the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action established by decision 1/CP.17 of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention at its seventeenth session,

In pursuit of the objective of the Convention, and being guided by its principles, including the principle of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, in the light of different national circumstances,

Recognizing the need for an effective and progressive response to the urgent threat of climate change on the basis of the best available scientific knowledge,

Also recognizing the specific needs and special circumstances of developing country Parties, especially those that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change, as provided for in the Convention,

(UN supports global tax to raise $400B)

UN calls for international tax to raise $400 billion to finance development needs

Financial needs of developing countries have long outstripped the willingness and ability of donors to provide aid

New York, 5 July 2012 –The United Nations is proposing an international tax, combined with other innovative financing mechanisms, to raise more than $400 billion annually for development and global challenges such as fighting climate change.

In its annual report on global development, *World Economic and Social Survey 2012: In Search of New Development Finance*, (WESS 2012) launched today, the UN says, in the midst of difficult financial times, many donor countries have cut back on development assistance. In 2011, for the first time in many years, aid flows declined in real terms.

The survey finds that the financial needs of developing countries have long outstripped the willingness and ability of donors to provide aid. And finding the necessary resources to achieve the Millennium Development Goals and meet other global challenges, such as addressing climate change, will be tough, especially for least developed countries.

The need for additional and more predictable financing has led to a search for new sources – not as a substitute for aid, but as a complement to it. A number of innovative initiatives have been launched during the past decade, mainly to fund global health programmes aimed at providing immunizations, AIDS and tuberculosis treatments to millions of people in the developing world. The UN survey finds that while these initiatives have successfully used new methods to channel development financing to combat diseases, they have hardly yielded any additional funding on top of traditional development assistance.

(Details of proposed global tax scheme)



The beginnings of innovative development finance – health as a testing ground

(Pensions are also being eyed as a funding source)

(Green finance for developing countries)

(Addis Ababa Action Agenda)

THIRD INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
FINANCING FOR DEVELOPMENT
13-16 JULY 2015 • ADDIS ABABA • ETHIOPIA
Addis Ababa Action Agenda
of the Third International Conference on
Financing for Development
(Addis Ababa Action Agenda)

(Why stop at just billions?)

OECD DEVELOPMENT matters
Home About Regions Themes Disclaimer Contact
ome Development Finance 2.0: From Billions to Trillions
Development Finance 2.0: From Billions to Trillions
31 July 2018 Development Matters Development finance Development finance, Development Finance Institutions
OECD DEVELOPMENT matters
Search ...

New Development Financing Proposals

- SDR (or special drawing rights), from IMF $150B-$270B
- Carbon taxes, $240B
- Leveraging SDR, $90B
- Financial transaction tax, $10B-70B
- Billionaire tax, $90B
- Currency trading tax, $30B
- EU emissions trading scheme, $5B
- Air passenger levy, $10B
- Certified emission reduction tax, $2B
- Current ODA Flow, $120B

It is no secret that we at the United Nations (the U.N.), has a rather expensive set of global goals. These goals vary from setting up a world government, to mass migration to overrun individual nations, to new development schemes, to controlling education, the media, and society as a whole.

These goals are ambitious, but as stated, expensive. Hundreds of billions of dollars (if not trillions) will be needed to accomplish this. However, people in the Western World are tired of footing the bill. Moreover, this will not be a one time thing. These influxes of cash will be required on an ongoing basis.

Most reasonable people will tell us to f*** off if they were presented with the truth about these “fundraising” schemes. Therefore, some sleight of hand will be needed. Let’s get into some of the more outrageous ideas.

In 2012, the UN released a 178 page manual titled ***New Development Financing***. This outlined a series of “revenue generating tools” (a.k.a. taxes) which could be leveraged in order to obtain a good chunk of this money. Not a parody, or satire, but serious proposals which aim to be implemented. Of course there is this minor problem: there is no global government — yet.

One has to admire the sheer gall of this proposal. Why stop at just one method for fleecing the public, then you can incorporate a dozen or more at a time?

Socialists never tire of proposing to ***tax the rich***, especially if those people happen to be billionaires. And why not? No one really needs billions of dollars to provide for their families.

Sure, many have worked hard for that money. And certainly there will be taxes paid at some point, but that is never enough. Of course, this would involve interfering with the sovereignty of individual nations. if only there was some sort of ***UN Parliament*** to set this in motion.

Banks typically charge a monthly fee, or a ***transaction fee***. You pay for the convenience of someone else holding onto your money. While this makes sense for the banks or credit unions, why should we stop there? Certainly a 25 cent to $2 charge per transaction could be levied onto your account by say, the Government or the U.N. The structure for banks to do it is already in place, so let's take advantage of it. Not only should you pay a fee for local transactions, but for international ones as well. See the next section.

There are amounts withheld when ***currency is traded***, either for cross border shopping or travel. Agencies which convert your money keep a small part for themselves. This is another great idea. Considering the climate emergency we are facing, people should have to pay a small tax for the privilege of travelling. Think of all the greenhouse gases that planes, cars, buses and trucks emit. If you must pollute the air, then at least pay the taxes when you convert your Dollars into Pounds, Euros or Yen. You're only getting 74 cents on the dollar anyway. It won't hurt anyone if you were suddenly only getting 72 cents.

One of our more well known initiatives is the carbon tax, which was expanded at the ***Paris Agreement*** in France. No, it's not misleading the public to refer to it as: (a) a price on pollution; (b) being socially responsible; or (c) cleaning the air. By putting a tax on everything, this will generate at least $250B a year. Article 9 of the Accord, in particular, outlines the various ways to "scale up" the Carbon tax. This money can then be used in the commodities market to generate huge profits for certain allied groups. The climate bond industry is expected to top $100T within a decade. Think of the wealth and the possibilities that can come of that.

If your nation cannot reduce your greenhouse gases, there are ***Carbon credits*** you can purchase. This is commonly referred to as ***cap-and-trade***. The idea is that there is no way you can meet these absurd standards without crashing your economy. We figure that you won't actually cause the total destruction of your nation, as politicians do need someone to pay their pensions. Instead, countries can buy these credits, which are effectively a licence to pollute. Sure, this won't help the environment, but at least you can pollute with a clear conscience. These credits will be sold to you by people whom we deem to be worthy of

dispensing them. The criteria? Nothing to see here, people. Just remember to be socially responsible. If you must pollute, at least pay the fee.

Critics will whine that this has nothing to do with a cleaner atmosphere. And sure, it is incredibly wasteful when we fly tens of thousands of people annually to climate change conferences. But consider the big picture. Our conferences and expert advice will ultimately lead to lower admissions — at some point. Furthermore, we can't do video-conferencing because …. reasons.

People with knowledge of 8th grade science have questioned whether Carbon Dioxide is really pollution. They claim it is critical for plants in the stage of photosynthesis. These science deniers blame climate change on "solar activity" and even spout out a chemical equation for photosynthesis

$6CO_2 + 6H_2O + light ==> C_6H_{12}O_6 + 6O_2$

Still not convinced? Just remember that according to ***Catherine McKenna*** – "If you actually say it louder, we've learned in the House of Commons, if you repeat it, say it louder, if that is your talking point people will totally believe it".

You shouldn't be flying (again, we are in a climate emergency). However, it's worth noting that there are ***airline fees & levies*** on every single flight. Security fees, luggage fees, administration fees, etc… While this is a great start, there should be a fee going towards the U.N. After all, we are trying to clean up the atmosphere that your selfishness is helping to pollute. These fees will help to rid the atmosphere of pollution.

We could ban flying altogether, but then, how would we get to our annual conferences on climate change? Moreover, who would be contributing to our climate funds if we weren't able to levy these fees? Better to charge you selfish people for polluting the air.

If we don't flying or driving completely (and it would kill us financially to do so), why not have a ***certified emissions reduction tax***? Let's decide how many emissions that a vehicle should be allowed to emit, and then impose taxes for manufacturers not being able to meet those targets? We could charge fees for the manufacturer directly, then impose extra fees on the drivers and owners. After all, why should the burden only come on some parties? Are they not all involved in polluting the air.

On a larger scale, let's establish some ***Special Drawing Rights***, or SDRs. Basically, this would be a global fund which all nations would contribute to. Then the enlightened ones would decide how this reserve is spent, on whom, and what the criteria will be. Of course, who says the money has to spent right away? We can always ***leverage the SDR*** in a fashion similar to the climate bonds industry. Imagine the wealth that be generated by "transferring" this fund to more profitable uses. Sure, some people won't get clean water, but life isn't perfect.

This is a start, but the U.N. will upscale ***from billions to trillions*** in due course. After all, if countries are willing to pay for certain things, then with some guilting they will be willing to pay some more. All that is needed is the right message.

Now, as for that minor question about where the money will be spent:

Ok, sure, there is this "minor" problem of the UN having a history of corruption. And sure, you will have absolutely no control over where your money is spent once it leaves the Government. But those worries shouldn't stop the nations from acting responsibly.

A good chunk of this money will go towards killing children in the 3rd world (a.k.a. abortion, or reproductive care). After all, what 10 year old girl who was raped by her uncle wouldn't want an abortion? It's more common than you might suppose — but don't you dare blame the culture. Just think, with less children in the world, the wealth we redistribute will be shared by less people, hence enlarging each person's individual share.

In a similar vein, we will spent money getting more women into the workforce. After all, what woman "wouldn't" want to remain childless while working in a mindless job? Workplaces will become more gender diverse. We may even start putting women in militaries.

Education will become more inclusive. SOGI (sexual orientation & gender identity) schooling will now be available in children as young as 4. Think about it, chopping off your privates will mean you never have children. Females getting involved with females (as opposed to men) is a 100% effective form of birth control. Homosexuality means never worrying about an unwanted pregnancy again. But don't worry, "reproductive care" will always be available should circumstances arise.

We will also be promoting diversity and multiculturalism in society. After all, who wouldn't want to see their culture, traditions, customs & heritage replaced by groups that are totally foreign. Our belief is that diversity is our strength. In other words: diversity is a product of our strength, and that strength is freedom. Forced multiculturalism — without a democratic mandate — is the best way to ensure a peaceful society.

Our new Ambassador of Global Relations: Richard Codenhove-Kalergi III, will oversee the transition to a raceless society. For too long, we have been divided by immutable characteristics. Time for a one-world vision. Don't worry, his late Grandfather had a plan.

The UN is also committed to ensuring that migration becomes a human right. No matter where you want to go, or why, we will get you there, and the host nation will pay for it. Why be denied access to a country simply because you were born somewhere else?

Sure, there's overhead, employee salaries, marketing, and paying for global conferences. And there are the legal fees for some staff members charged with sex crimes. But at least some of the money does go towards helping people in the 3rd world.

JUST REMEMBER

"If you actually say it louder, we've learned in the House of Commons, if you repeat it, say it louder, if that is your talking point people will totally believe it".

CANADA, CORPORATE, CORRUPTION, GLOBALISM, IMMIGRATION (CANADA), SATIRE/PARODY, UN/WHO, WORLD